

### REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-24, 26-44, and 46-48 are pending, with claims 1, 17, 26, 33, 36, 42, and 46 being independent. Claims 10, 25, 45, and 49 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 11-12, 17, 20, 23-24, 26, 28-42, & 46 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Applicant's amended claims are allowable over any combination of Peck, Karkhanis, and Arndt. For example, the proposed Peck-Karkhanis combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of amended claim 1 because neither Peck nor Karkhanis teaches or suggests "posting a descriptor ... to a virtual interface between the first process and a second process" as recited in amended claim 1. Although Peck discloses the use of an interface unit to support an interface between main memory device and a specific processing device, Peck's interface unit is not the same as a virtual interface between two different processes having two different virtual address memory spaces. In addition, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the cited portion of Karkhanis (col. 3, lines 6-25) merely discloses that "VLM objects exhibit the same basic characteristics ... as other virtual memory objects created with conventional service programming interfaces" and simply does not teach or suggest a virtual interface between two different processes having two different virtual address memory spaces.

Thus, Peck does not disclose all the features of amended independent claim 1, and Karkhanis does not cure such deficiencies of Peck nor does it so teach or suggest. Therefore, the proposed Peck- Karkhanis combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 1 and amended claim 1 should be in condition for allowance. Amended independent claims 17, 26, 33, 36, 42 recite similar features as claim 1 and are patentably distinguishable over the proposed Peck- Karkhanis combination for analogous reasons to those discussed for independent claim 1.

Thus, all the pending claims are allowable for at least the reasons provided above.

The foregoing comments made with respect to the positions taken by the Examiner are not to be construed as acquiescence with other positions of the Examiner that have not been explicitly contested. Accordingly, the above arguments for patentability of a claim should not be construed as implying that there are not other valid reasons for patentability of that claim or other claims.

Applicants ask that all claims be allowed. Please apply any credits or additional charges to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Feb. 29, 2008

/Cheng C. Ko/  
Cheng C. Ko  
Reg. No. 54,227  
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
PTO Customer No.:20985  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, California 92130  
(858) 678-5070 telephone  
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10808113.doc